



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,474	12/23/2003	Masahiko Matsukawa	21581-00312-US	8031
30678	7590	11/28/2006		EXAMINER
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP				ZHENG, LOIS L
P.O. BOX 2207				
WILMINGTON, DE 19899-2207				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,474	MATSUKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner Lois Zheng	Art Unit 1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 4.5 and 7-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/12/06

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. Claim 1 is amended in view of the amendment filed 12 September 2006. Claims 4-5 and 7-12 remain withdrawn as they are directed to non-elected invention. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 6 are currently under examination.

### ***Status of Previous Rejections***

2. All previous rejections are withdrawn in view of the claim amendments filed 12 September 2006. New grounds of rejection are established as follows.

### ***Terminal Disclaimer***

3. The terminal disclaimer filed on 12 September 2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Patent Application Serial No. 10/743,387 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heimann et al. US 2003/0209290 A1(Heimann).

Heimann teaches a substantially phosphate free metal surface treatment composition(page 2 paragraph [0014]) comprising about 0 to about 40% water soluble

Art Unit: 1742

silicate(paragraph [0034]), and at least one dopant material selected from the group of fluorotitanic acid, fluorozirconic acid, water soluble salts of titanium, zirconium, aluminum, iron, boron (borates), gallium, cobalt, zinc, copper, magnesium, manganese and the mixture thereof, in an amount of about 0.001 to about 5%(paragraph [0038], [0050], claims 1, 3 and 12).

Regarding claims 1-2, the water soluble salts of titanium, zirconium, aluminum, gallium, cobalt, zinc, copper, magnesium, manganese and the mixture thereof read on the claimed components (A)-(D). Even though Heimann does not explicitly teach amount of each of the water soluble salts above, Heimann does teach that these material, functioning as a dopant, can be in an amount of about 0.001 to about 5%. Based on the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets that the broadest concentration range for each of the water soluble salts listed above is about 0.001 to about 5%, in accordance with the scope of Heimann. Therefore, the silicate and each of the water soluble salts containing components (A)-(D) of the instant invention as taught in the treatment solution of Heimann have concentration ranges that overlap the claimed component concentration ranges. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05. The selection of claimed component concentration ranges from the disclosed ranges of Heimann would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since Heimann teaches the same utilities in its disclosed component concentration ranges.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, the water soluble salt such as iron chloride and borates in the treatment solution of Heimann contain iron and borate that read on the

Art Unit: 1742

claimed at least one accelerators as recited in claims 3 and 6. The concentration ranges of iron and borate as taught by Heimann(i.e. dopant concentration range), based on the broadest reasonable interpretation, also overlap the claimed accelerator concentration range. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05. The selection of claimed iron and borate concentration ranges from the disclosed ranges of Heimann would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since Heimann teaches the same utilities in its disclosed iron and borate concentration ranges.

6. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan US 5,449,414(Dolan).

Dolan teaches a substantially phosphate free(claim 1) conversion coating composition comprising 5-500mg/m<sup>2</sup> of complex fluoride of Ti, Zr, Hf and Si, and the mixture thereof(Abstract, col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 25) and cation elements selected from Co, Mg, Mn, Zn, Zr, Fe, Al and/or Cu, wherein the ratio of the cation elements and the complex fluoride is at least 1:3(col. 3 lines 21-29).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, the complex fluorides of Ti, Zr, and Hf as taught by Dolan meet the limitations of claimed at least one of Zr, Ti and Hf and the claimed fluorine. The cation elements as taught by Dolan read on the claimed component (A) to (D). The complex fluoride of Si reads on the claimed Si containing compound:

In addition, Even though Dolan does not explicitly teach amount of each of the cation elements above, Dolan does teach that the ratio of cation elements and complex fluoride is at least 1:3. Since the complex fluoride of Dolan is in the amount of 5 to

500mg/m<sup>2</sup>, the cation elements of Dolan should be in the amount of at least 1.67 mg/m<sup>2</sup>. Based on this dry coating amount, the examiner takes a position that the corresponding concentration of the cation elements in the coating solution of Dolan would have inherently overlapped the claimed concentration ranges for components (A)-(D). The concentration of complex fluoride of Si as taught by Dolan would have also inherently overlapped the claimed Si containing compound concentration. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05. The selection of claimed component concentration ranges from the disclosed ranges of Dolan would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since Dolan teaches the same utilities in its disclosed component concentration ranges.

7. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan US 5,449,414(Dolan) in view of Ries et al. US 3,682,713(Ries).

The teachings of Dolan are discussed in paragraph 6 above. However, Dolan does not explicitly teach the claimed accelerator as recited in claims 3 and 6.

Ries teaches a substantially phosphate free coating composition comprising complex fluorides of Ti and/or Zr(col. 2 lines 23-33) and water soluble salts of Zn and or Co(col. 3 lines 12-20). The coating composition of Ries further contains 0.5-30g/l of accelerators such as nitrates, chlorates, bromates, hydrogen peroxide and nitro group-containing compounds(col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 11).

Regarding claims 3 and 6, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated 0.5-30g/l of accelerators, such as nitrates, chlorates,

bromates, hydrogen peroxide and nitro group-containing compounds, as taught by Ries into the coating solution of Dolan in order to speed up the conversion coating process.

In addition, the accelerator concentration range as taught by Dolan in view of Ries overlaps the claimed accelerator concentration range. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05. The selection of claimed accelerator concentration range from the disclosed accelerator concentration range of Dolan in view of Ries would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since Dolan in view of Ries teach the same utilities in their disclosed accelerator concentration range.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 6 filed 12 September 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1742

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lois Zheng whose telephone number is (571) 272-1248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LLZ

ROY KING  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

*R-11*